

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-23 are now pending in this patent application.

In this paper, claim 4 has been canceled, claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 20 have been amended, and claim 23 has been added.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PREVIOUS OFFICE ACTION

As indicated in **Status 1**) on the Office Action Summary page, this Office Action corrects the Office Action in this application dated March 31, 2010. More specifically, this Office Action corrects ambiguities in the March 31, 2010 non-final Office Action, which has been withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests that the status of the March 31, 2010 Office Action and this Office Action be acknowledged in the next communication from the USPTO.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter that had been recited in claims 4-6, 12, 16-18 and 20-22. For reasons presented below, Applicant submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

### SECTION 112, 2<sup>ND</sup> PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

Claims 1-10 and 12-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant traverses this rejection insofar as it might be deemed applicable to claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-23 as now presented.

Claims 1 and 4-7 have been amended to obviate the specific objections lodged by the Examiner. In addition, Applicant has carefully reviewed all of the claims and has made amendments where appropriate to ensure that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. In claim 19, the expression, "locking units and guide units which can be used for military purposes," is a proper introduction of these elements, does not refer back to an earlier recitation of these elements, and further limits the claimed subject matter. Applicant therefore submits that claim 19 complies fully with 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, and requests that this rejection of claim 19 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### PRIOR ART REJECTION I

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4077590 (Shorey). Applicants traverse this rejection insofar as it might be deemed applicable to claims 1-3, 7-10 and 14 as now presented.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter that had been recited in claim 4. Thus, claim 1 now specifies that "tread-proof elastic filling bodies are contained in the lashing point housings." Applicant notes that claims 2 and 3, from which claim 4 depended, were subjected to a rejection based on prior art, while the subject matter of claim 4 was specifically recognized by the Examiner as being allowable. Applicant therefore submits that this rejection has been obviated and trusts that the Examiner will find amended claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10, 13 and 14, as now presented, to be allowable.

In view of the amendments to claims 1-3, 7-10, 13 and 14 and in view of the foregoing observations and arguments, Applicant submits that the disclosure in Shorey cannot meet the requirements of claims 1-3, 7-10, 13 and 14 and cannot properly serve as basis for rejecting these claims under 35 USC § 102(b). Applicant therefore requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### PRIOR ART REJECTION II

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shorey. Applicants traverse this rejection insofar as it might be deemed applicable to claim 15 as now presented.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1, which is now allowable, for reasons made evident in the discussion above under the heading PRIOR ART REJECTION I. Claim 15 is thus allowable, at least because of its dependence from an allowable parent claim. Applicant therefore requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### ALLOWABILITY OF NEW CLAIM

New independent claim 23 incorporates all of the limitations that had been recited in claim 1 and also the subject matter recited in claim 5. Thus, claim 23 specifies that "the lashing point housings contain a lashing point shaft, on which a receptacle allows the fastening of lugs or

additional adaptors by means of a plug connector." That is, claim 23 recites subject matter that was specifically recognized by the Examiner as being allowable. Applicant therefore trusts that the Examiner will find claim 23 to be allowable.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments, observations and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections stated in the outstanding Office Action and recognize all of the pending claims as allowable.

If unresolved matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Frederick R. Handren, Reg. No. 32,874, at the telephone number provided below, so that these matters can be addressed and resolved expeditiously.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By *Frederick R. Handren #32874*  
for Andrew D. Meikle  
Registration No.: 32,868  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant